

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.D. But 1450 Alexandris, Vignal 22313-1450 www.npto.gov

Y .				
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
APPLICATION NO.			023070086121	2808
		Robert I Fischer		

20350

07/31/2003

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER

EIGHTH FLOOR

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER MEHTA, ASHWIN D

PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 1638 DATE MAILED: 07/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. 14					
		Application No.	-	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/812,283		FISCHER ET AL.	
		Examiner		Art Unit	
		Ashwin Mehta		1638	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover si	heet with the c	orresp ndence ad	dress
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. alons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CPR. 1: SIX (8) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BY (8) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Point of the control of the communication of the communication. Point of the reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will be set of the communication. BY (8) White the set of the communication of the c	36(a). In no event, however within the statutory minimu ill apply and will expire SIX cause the application to be	may a reply be time m of thirty (30) days (6) MONTHS from	s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co	/. mmunication.
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 M	1ay 2003 .			
2a)⊠		s action is non-final	l.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under ion of Claims	nce except for form Ex parte Quayle, 19	al matters, pr 35 C.D. 11, 4	osecution as to the 53 O.G. 213.	e merits is
	Claim(s) <u>1.2.5-10.12,13,15 and 17-29</u> is/are p	anding in the smaller			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray				
	Claim(s) is/are withdrav	vn from consideration	on.	•	
	Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1,2,5-10,12,15 and 17-29</u> is/are reject				
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	ea.			
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	election requireme	nt.		
	The specification is objected to by the Examiner				
	The drawing(s) filed on 15 May 2003 is/are: a)		signated to but th	o Evaminas	
.0,23	Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
11) 🗆 :	The proposed drawing correction filed on				r
,_	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep			· ·	
12) 🔲 -	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa				
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f)	
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			(-) (-)-	
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been receive	d.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents			n No.	
	Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bur ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	ty documents have eau (PCT Rule 17.2	been receive	d in this National S	Stage
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic				annlication)
· a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language producknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	visional application I	nas been rece	ived.	арриосиоту.
1) Notice	oor of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) hation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Not	ice of Informal Pa	(PTO-413) Paper No(s atent Application (PTO	
S. Patent and Tr	ademark Office	6) 📙 Oth			
TO-326 (Rev	Office Acti	on Summary	F	Part of Paper No. 11	

Art Unit: 1638

DETAILED ACTION

 The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Note: On 15 May 2003, Applicants submitted a supplemental response to the Office action mailed 15 July 2003. On page 1 of that response, Applicants indicated that the paper contains the responses and amendments filed in the paper submitted on 14 January 2003, as well as a new response to the drawings and obviousness-type double patenting rejection. As the remarks in the paper submitted on 14 January 20003 were repeated in the paper submitted 15 May 2003, this Office action will only refer to the response submitted on 15 May 2003.

- The objection to the specification for containing an embedded hyperlink is withdrawn, in light of its removal.
- The objection to the sequence listing is withdrawn, in light of the submission of the substitute sequence listing.
- The rejection of claims 9-15, 17-21, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, is withdrawn, in light of the claim amendments.

The corrected or substitute drawings were received on 20 May 2003. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Objections

6. Claim 1 remains objected to for the reasons of record stated in the Office action mailed 15 July 2002 under item 5. In the paper received 20 May 2003, Applicants indicate that the claim was amended as suggested (page 6, 1st full paragraph). However, the amendments to the claim do not include the suggested change.

Claim 1, as amended, is also objected to for the following informality: in line 5, the article "a" is missing before --promoter--.

Double Patenting

7. Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12, 13, 15, 17-24 remain and new claims 25-29 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 9-17, and 20-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,064, for the reasons of record stated in the Office action mailed 15 July 2002. In the response submitted 15 May 2003, Applicants indicate that they will provide a terminal disclaimer when the claims have been indicated as otherwise allowable and if the rejection still applies (response, page 6, 2nd full paragraph). Applicants' intent is acknowledged. The rejection is maintained.

Art Unit: 1638

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. Claim 2 remains and claims 15-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, for the reasons of record stated in the Office action mailed 15 July 2002 under item 7.

Regarding claim 2: Applicants, in the paper submitted 15 May 2003, indicate that the word "about" was deleted (page 6, 3rd full paragraph). However, the amendment only appears in the marked-up version of the claim amendments, and not in the clean version.

In claim 15: the recitation, "modulating endosperm development" in lines 1-2 renders the claim and those dependent thereon indefinite. The claim is dependent on claim 1, which indicates that expression of the polynucleotide inhibits gene expression when introduced into a plant. However, the preamble of claim 15 indicates that endosperm development is "modulated," which encompasses any type of change, and broadens than the limitation of claim 1.

9. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 18, 20-24 remain and claims 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, for the reasons of record stated in the Office action mailed 15 July 2002 under item 8. Applicants traverse the rejection in the

Art Unit: 1638

paper received 15 May 2003. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but were not found persuasive.

Applicants argue that amended claim 1 recites that the polypeptide comprises a WD40 repeat, and that the specification indicates that WD40 repeats are motifs involved protein-protein interactions (response, page 7, 2nd paragraph). However, this repeat is also present on proteins that have functions that are different from SEQ ID NO: 4 and other FIE polypeptides. Ach et al. (Plant Cell, 1997, Vol. 9, pages 1595-1606), for example, teach proteins containing WD40 repeats that interact with retinoblastoma proteins. Ach et al. also assert that WD-40 repeats are present has been found in a number of eukaryotic regulatory proteins, including G-proteins and the Arabidopsis COP1, which is involved in light-regulated signal transduction (pages 1596-1597). The presence of a WD40 repeat therefore does not correlate a structure with the functional activity expressed by SEQ ID NO: 4.

Applicants continue, arguing that the claims provide at least two structural limitations, percent identity with a reference amino acid sequence and the presence of a well-known protein motif, and that the specification thus defines a physical and structural property of the invention, as explicitly required by the court in *University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.* (response, paragraph bridging pages 7-8). However, Applicants do not describe any structure that differs from SEQ ID NO: 4 by as much as 40% and which has the functional activity of SEQ ID NO: 4. The added limitation that the polypeptide encoded by the claimed nucleic acid molecule contains a WD40 repeat, does not correlate the structure of the polypeptide to the functional activity of SEQ ID NO: 4, as WD40 repeats are present on structures that have different functional activities. The specification does not describe any other domains or amino acid sequences of

Art Unit: 1638

SEQ ID NO: 4 that are essential to its functional activity. Applicants also argue that the claims only encompass polynucleotides with a particular function (response, page 8, 1st full paragraph). However, again, Applicants have not described any structure that differs from SEQ ID NO: 4 by as much as 40%, while still containing a WD40 repeat, that also retains the functional activity of SEQ ID NO: 4.

10. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 18, 20-24 remain and claims 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims, for the reasons of record stated in the Office action mailed 15 July 2002 under item 9. Applicants traverse the rejection in the paper received 15 May 2003. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but were not found persuasive.

Applicants argue that those of skill could have readily prepared and used the polynucleotides within the full scope of the claims (response, page 8, last paragraph). The Examiner maintains that that specification does not provide sufficient guidance in the amino acid sequences of SEQ ID NO: 4 that may be changed without changing its functional activity. As discussed above, Ach et al. teach that the WD40 domain is present in a variety of proteins having diverse functions. This domain alone is not responsible for the functional activity of SEQ ID NO: 4. The specification does not teach provide any guidance in how the other amino acid sequences may be changed.

Applicants also argue that the amended claims encompass antisense constructs, and sense constructs for sense suppression (response, page 9, 1st paragraph). However, as written, claims 1

Art Unit: 1638

and 15 broadly indicate that expression of the polynucleotide will inhibit any gene expression. It is suggested that the claims be amended to indicate that FIE gene expression is inhibited.

Further, claim 15 broadly encompasses modulating endosperm development in any manner, whereas the specification indicates that suppression of FIE3 gene expression only enhances endosperm development in the absence of fertilization. It is suggested that claim 15 also be amended to indicate this.

Summarv

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

No claim is allowed

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashwin Mehta, whose telephone number is 703-306-4540. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays and alternate Fridays from 8:00 A.M to 5:30 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amy Nelson, can be reached at 703-306-3218. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3014 and 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9307 for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

July 30, 2003

Ashwin D. Mehta, Ph.D. Primary Examiner Art Unit 1638